

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-16 34-38, 40, and 41 are amended, and claims 43 and 44 are newly added. Claims 2-12 and 17-33 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 14-16, and 34-44 are pending for consideration. Applicant believes this filing is fully responsive to the Office Action, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.¹

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Almatrahi for participating in a teleconference with Applicant's representative on July 15, 2010. During the teleconference, certain types of clarifying claim amendments to claim 1 were discussed that, if made, Examiner Almatrahi indicated would overcome the art of record, possibly subject to further search. Amended independent claims 1, 34, and 41 include recitations such as those discussed in the teleconference.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 14-16, and 34-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2005/0137904 to Lane et al. (hereinafter "Lane") in view of an NPL reference by Hiranaka et al. (hereinafter "Hiranaka").

Response to §103 Rejection

In making out the rejection of independent claim 1, the Office relies on Lane and Hiranaka and argues that it would have been obvious to combine their

¹ The Office Action appears to only address independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action apparently does not comply with MPEP § 706(c)(2), which requires that "[t]he pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified" (emphasis added). Nevertheless, in view of the productive discussion with the Examiner on July 15, Applicant has elected to file this response with a Request for Continued Examination in order to best expedite prosecution of this application. Applicant respectfully requests that, in the event the next Office communication is not a Notice of Allowance, any such communication fully comply with MPEP § 706.

teachings. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that neither Lane nor Hiranaka, either singly or in combination, teach all the claimed subject matter.

For example, amended claim 1 recites:

sending an identification query to an asset identification tag,
the asset identification tag having a global routing prefix of an
Internet Protocol address stored therein;

receiving, from the asset identification tag, an asset identifier
and the global routing prefix (emphasis added).

Lane discloses a secured lien monitoring system that includes a tag affixed to property or documents (Lane, abstract). The tag data includes an identification number used to identify the tag, which is associated with a particular asset and secured lien (*Id.*). For example, the identification data may be an Electronic Product Code (EPC), and a computer may read the tag, send the EPC to the Object Name Service, and obtain further information about the asset and the lien (Lane, ¶ 15).

However, Lane does not teach or suggest that the tag stores a global routing prefix, or indeed any network information whatsoever. Rather, the Object Name Service tells the computer where to locate information about the EPC (Lane, ¶¶ 13 and 82). Furthermore, while Lane discloses that other information, such as lien filing numbers, lien filing places, and other lien-related information may be included in the RFID tag data, nothing in Lane suggests including a global routing prefix on the tag. Therefore, as agreed to by the Examiner during the interview, Lane does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified recitations of claim 1.

Hiranaka discloses examples of mapping applications to logical addresses using the IPv6 address space (Hiranaka, abstract). However, while Hiranaka discloses that an IPv6 prefix can specify a gateway, Hiranaka does not disclose or suggest storing the IPv6 prefix, or any other part of an IPv6 address, on an

asset identification tag. Therefore, as agreed to by the Examiner during the interview, Hiranaka fails to cure the deficiencies of Lane, and also does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified recitations of claim 1.

As discussed, neither Lane nor Hiranaka, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggest all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Turning to independent claim 34, the claim recites:

 sending an identification query to an asset identification tag,
the asset identification tag having a global routing prefix of an
Internet Protocol address stored therein;

 receiving, from the asset identification tag, the global routing
prefix (emphasis added).

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, neither Lane nor Hiranaka teaches or suggests at least the above-identified recitations of independent claim 34. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Turning to independent claim 41, the claim recites:

 receiving, from an asset identification tag, identification data
having a first data element comprising a global routing prefix of an
Internet Protocol address and a second data element comprising an
asset identifier indicating one or more asset properties of an asset,
the asset identification tag having stored therein the global routing
prefix and the asset identifier (emphasis added).

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, neither Lane nor Hiranaka teaches or suggests at least the above-identified recitations of independent claim 41. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Claims 14-16 depend from claim 1, claims 35-40 depend from claim 34,

and claim 42, and new claims 43 and 44, depend from claim 41, and these dependent claims are allowable as depending from their respective allowable base claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in their respective base claims, are not taught or suggested by Lane or Hiranaka, either singly or in combination.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this communication, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 2010-07-22

By: /paul mitchell/
Paul W. Mitchell, Reg. No.: 44,453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382